



Date: January 15, 2003
To: Inter-Regional Partnership
From: IRP Staff
RE: Growth Boundary Survey Results

Background

Following the interest expressed by the Inter-Regional Partnership in the subject of growth boundaries, the issue was discussed at the last two meetings of 2002. A presentation on urban growth boundaries was given at the September 18th meeting and a preliminary summary of a staff survey of growth boundaries in the IRP region was handed out at the November meeting. This report, and the attached spreadsheet, represents the completion of the background research associated with growth boundaries. John Fregonese, of Fregonese Calthorpe Associates, will make a presentation at the March 19th IRP meeting on the Contra Costa County Shaping Our Future growth management project and his experience working on growth boundaries across the country.

Discussion

The following list identifies the jurisdictions in the IRP area with some form of adopted growth boundary:

<u>Alameda</u>	<u>Santa Clara</u>	<u>San Joaquin</u>
Hayward	Cupertino	Manteca
Livermore	Gilroy	Ripon
Pleasanton	Milpitas	Stockton
	Monte Sereno	
<u>Contra Costa</u>	Morgan Hill	<u>Stanislaus</u>
Contra Costa County	Palo Alto	Newman
San Ramon	San Jose	

With few exceptions, the growth boundaries were designed to completely surround the jurisdictions implementing them. Jurisdictions with incomplete boundaries either have city limits that are partially shared by neighboring jurisdictions or the boundary was developed to channel growth away from an open space or agricultural resource of special importance to the community involved. The City of Livermore had a partial boundary for six years before the city council voted to go ahead and adopt a proposed voter initiative that completes the boundary.

Most of the growth boundaries were adopted by city councils with the remainder enacted via local ballot initiatives. Most of the jurisdictions allow their governing body to change the boundaries, as needed, as part of updating the general plan (up to four opportunities a year) while the cities of Hayward, Livermore and Milpitas require voter approval for any changes to the boundary. The City of Pleasanton and Contra Costa County allow their governing bodies to make minor changes to the growth boundary but require voter approval for major expansions.

Growth boundaries within the IRP area are known by a variety of labels including:

- Urban growth boundary
- Urban limit line
- Primary urban service boundary
- Urban service boundary
- 20-year planning boundary
- Primary urban area

Most jurisdictions have either reduced or expanded their urban service areas to match their adopted growth boundaries or are currently in the process of doing so. The City of Gilroy is an exception in that their growth boundary is smaller than their urban service area. Gilroy restricts expansion of its urban growth boundary to land within its urban service area. The City of Morgan Hill takes the opposite approach in relating its growth boundary and urban service area. Morgan Hill uses its urban service area as a short-term boundary to define where development is expected to occur within five years. Expansion of the Morgan Hill urban service area is limited to land within the long-term growth boundary.

Most growth boundaries were implemented primarily to preserve open space (parks, ridgelines, hillsides, wetlands, and other open space lands) and agriculture. Plans implementing the growth boundaries require that urban development should be compact in order to accommodate future growth within the boundary. However, few boundaries were implemented primarily to change development standards within the boundary. San Ramon is one exception where the primary function of the growth boundary was to promote smart growth by encouraging infill and mixed-use development. Whether the primary focus is the preservation of open space or smart growth development, both methods may result in jurisdictions promoting a more compact development pattern.

Currently staff is in the process of evaluating if there are ways to get the State to provide incentives for growth boundaries that are instituted with an accompanying plan to accommodate future growth (both housing and economic development) within the proposed boundary. Qualifying jurisdictions would be given priority in regional and state funding. Since growth boundaries can be instituted throughout the state, it should avoid the regional focus issue some agencies have in relation to State bond funding. A set of smart growth planning principles could be attached that influence housing and job types and density, TOD orientation and preservation of resources and open space. These principles would be incorporated in General Plan and zoning documents in exchange for funding priority to implement them.

Recommended Actions

Direct staff as to the priorities for future growth boundary research and products. Some issues that staff recommends for Partnership consideration include:

- Should wider research be conducted on the relationship between growth boundaries and residential development restrictions and the associated affects on planning for projected residential growth?
- Should a survey be conducted to determine what the amount of available land within the growth boundaries are and related planned densities?
- Should growth boundaries be a component of an inter-regional land use plan?

Growth Boundary Survey Attachment

County	Jurisdiction	UGB/ULL	Relation to Urban Service Area	When Adopted	How Adopted	Impacts	How Often Can It Be Updated	How is Boundary Updated	Ordinance
Alameda	Alameda	N/A							
Alameda	Alameda County	N/A							
Alameda	Albany	N/A							
Alameda	Berkeley	N/A							
Alameda	Dublin	N/A							
Alameda	Emeryville	N/A							
Alameda	Fremont	N/A							
Alameda	Hayward	Urban Limit Line		1993	City Council	No study or evaluation	As part of general plan updates	Voters	Part of general plan have copy
Alameda	Livermore	Urban Growth Boundary	Same as USA with a couple, limited exceptions	1997	- Southern boundary , City Council (1997) with voter ratification in 2000 - Northern boundary , City Council (2002)	No study or evaluation	As part of general plan updates	Voters	Resolution 99-284 have copy
Alameda	Newark	N/A							
Alameda	Oakland	N/A							
Alameda	Piedmont	N/A							
Alameda	Pleasanton	Urban Growth Boundary		1996	Voters	No study or evaluation	No formal process	- City Council for minor changes with no new housing - Voters for major change or new housing	Measure FF have copy
Alameda	San Leandro	N/A							
Alameda	Union City	N/A							
Contra Costa	Antioch	N/A							
Contra Costa	Brentwood	N/A							
Contra Costa	Clayton	N/A							
Contra Costa	Concord	N/A							
Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	Urban Limit Line	N/A	1990	Voters	No study or evaluation		- 4/5 vote of Board of Supervisors so long as 65/35 ratio maintained - Voters decide any proposed changes for more than 35% urban development	Ordinance No. 91-1 Measure C (1990) have copy
Contra Costa	Danville	N/A							
Contra Costa	El Cerrito	N/A							
Contra Costa	Hercules	N/A							
Contra Costa	Lafayette	N/A							
Contra Costa	Martinez	N/A							
Contra Costa	Moraga	N/A							
Contra Costa	Oakley	N/A							
Contra Costa	Orinda	N/A							
Contra Costa	Pinole	N/A							
Contra Costa	Pittsburg	N/A							

Growth Boundary Survey Attachment

Contra Costa	Pleasant Hill	N/A							
Contra Costa	Richmond	N/A							
Contra Costa	San Pablo	N/A							
Contra Costa	San Ramon	Urban Growth Boundary	City services limited to UGB. No control over water, sewer, fire & police (external agencies)	2002	Voters	No study or evaluation	As part of general plan updates	- 4/5 vote of City Council - Voter review of boundary in 2010	Resolution 99-96 and part of general plan have copy
Contra Costa	Walnut Creek	N/A							
San Joaquin	Escalon	N/A							
San Joaquin	Lathrop	N/A							
San Joaquin	Lodi	N/A							
San Joaquin	Manteca	Primary Urban Service Boundary							Part of general plan have copy
San Joaquin	Ripon	Primary Urban Area		1996					Part of general plan have copy
San Joaquin	San Joaquin County	N/A							
San Joaquin	Stockton	Urban Service Boundary	Same as the urban service area	1990	City Council	No study or evaluation	As part of general plan updates	City Council	have copy
San Joaquin	Tracy	N/A							
Santa Clara	Campbell	N/A							
Santa Clara	Cupertino	Urban Growth Boundary	Same as the urban service area	1997	City Council	No study or evaluation	As part of comprehensive general plan updates	City Council	Resolution 4809 and part of general plan have copy
Santa Clara	Gilroy	20-Year Planning Boundary	Smaller than USA, boundary expansions only occur within USA	2002 (current version of general plan)	City Council	No study or evaluation	As part of general plan updates	City Council	Part of general plan have copy
Santa Clara	Los Altos	N/A							
Santa Clara	Los Altos Hills	N/A							
Santa Clara	Los Gatos	N/A							
Santa Clara	Milpitas	Urban Growth Boundary	UGB larger than USA, city working to make both the same	1998	Voters	No study or evaluation	Only under special circumstances	- Voters - Council can extend services in limited instances, but can not change boundary	Resolution 6796 have copy
Santa Clara	Monte Sereno	Urban Growth Boundary	Same as urban service area	1996	City Council	Yes, housing development request has been made for a copy	As part of general plan updates	City Council	Part of general plan have copy
Santa Clara	Morgan Hill	Urban Growth Boundary	Larger than urban service area	1996	City Council	No study or evaluation	As part of general plan updates	City Council	Part of general plan have copy
Santa Clara	Mountain View	N/A							
Santa Clara	Palo Alto	Urban Growth Boundary	Same as urban service area	1998	City Council	No study or evaluation	As part of general plan updates	City Council	Part of general plan have copy

Growth Boundary Survey Attachment

Santa Clara	San Jose	Urban Growth Boundary	Same as USA with a couple, limited exceptions	1996	City Council	No study or evaluation	Major changes allowed every 10 years, minor changes as part of general plan updates	City Council	Part of general plan and municipal code have copy
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	N/A							
Santa Clara	Santa Clara County	N/A							
Santa Clara	Saratoga	N/A							
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	N/A							
Stanislaus	Ceres	N/A							
Stanislaus	Hughson	N/A							
Stanislaus	Modesto	N/A							
Stanislaus	Newman								
Stanislaus	Oakdale	N/A							
Stanislaus	Patterson	N/A							
Stanislaus	Stanislaus County	N/A							
Stanislaus	Turlock	N/A							
Stanislaus	Waterford	N/A							